



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,448	10/21/2003	Malcolm Sargeant	09314.0044-00000	8087

7590 08/23/2006

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow  
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.  
901 New York Avenue N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

TRAN, HANH VAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/691,448	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SARGEANT ET AL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hanh V. Tran	<b>Art Unit</b> 3637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/3/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/3/2006 has been entered.

***Specification***

2. The amendment filed 8/3/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the upper and lower cores being "vibration isolating" cores.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "vibration isolating".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3637

5. Claims 1-4, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 5,402,734 to Galpin et al.

Galpin et al disclose an optical table comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including, such as shown in Fig 2, in height order: a top skin 13, an upper vibration isolating core 25, an intermediate skin 23, a lower vibration isolating core 21 and a bottom skin 15, wherein the upper and lower vibration isolating cores provide rigidity to the optical table, the intermediate skin comprises two sheets (49,23,41) bonded together, a spacer layer 61 arranged under the top skin 13 and separated from the upper core 25 by a midskin, the core 25 is made of formed steel, and a plurality of legs 12 supported the table above ground.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 5-6, and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galpin et al.

Galpin discloses all the elements as discussed above including the bonding between the elements being performed using a cold or hot cure adhesive. The differences being that Galpin et al does not clearly disclose the material of the core is made of composite material or aluminum honeycomb, and the method recited in claims 10-13. In regard to the material of the core, it is well known in the optical table art to have the core being made of a composite material or aluminum honeycomb in order to provide structural support to the table. In regard to the method recited in claims 10-13, since Galpin et al discloses all the elements recited therein, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skill in the art to perform the method step recited therein.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments on page 4 that Galpin fails to disclose the upper and lower cores provide rigidity to the optical table since Galpin discloses that the core 25 being positioned to prevent contaminants from passing through the holes into the honeycomb core of the tabletop, the examiner takes the position that the structure and material of the upper core 25 of Galpin does provide rigidity to the tabletop and thus meets the claimed limitation.

10. In response to applicant's arguments that the upper core 25 of Galpin fails to teach vibration damping or isolation, the examiner takes the position that since the claims are apparatus/article claims, claims directed to an apparatus/article must be

Art Unit: 3637

distinguished from the prior art of record in terms of structure rather than function, and that the present claimed language fails to provide adequate structural limitations in order to distinguish from the prior art of record. Further, the upper core 25 must absorb a certain amount of energy or force transmitted therethrough; hence, providing a vibration damping or isolation core.

11. In response to applicant's argument that Galpin fails to teach a method of manufacturing an optical table "comprising making at least two subassemblies, wherein each subassembly is made by bonding a core to upper and lower skins", again the examiner takes the position that the claimed language fails to provide adequate structural limitations to the claims in order to distinguish applicant's claimed invention of the subassemblies from the prior art of record. And that since Galpin teaches all the structural limitations in the method claims, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skill in the art to perform the method steps recited in said method claims.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tokonabe et al, Turner et al, Rose et al, and Golstein all show structures similar to various elements of applicant's disclosure.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

Art Unit: 3637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HVT

August 21, 2006



**Hanh V. Tran**  
**Art Unit 3637**